

Senate, no. 343, commonwealth of Massachusetts, in Senate, May 24, 1869

1

SENATE No. 343. Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In Senate, May 24, 1869.

The Joint Special Committee on Woman's Suffrage, to whom was recommitted the Report on the same subject, have considered the same and

REPORT:

That they make no change in their former Report, except as follows. From the words, "the committee," on the thirteenth page of the printed Report, Senate Document, No. 325, to the word "self-protection" on the fifteenth page, they report the same in a new draft. They also strike out from the Report, Appendix B.

Per order of the Committee, W. GRISWOLD, *Chairman*.

2

Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In Senate, May 7, 1869.

The Joint Special Committee, to whom was committed the petition of George W. Stacy, and thirty-three others, citizens of Milford, praying for an amendment of the constitution of the State, so as to extend suffrage to women, on the same terms with men, and the numerous other petitions in aid thereof; also the petition of Mrs Dolly Chandler, and one hundred and ninety-four other women, of Lancaster, as follows: "The undersigned women of Lancaster, believing that the exercise of the elective franchise would diminish the purity, the dignity, and the moral influence of woman, and bring into the family circle a dangerous element of discord, without securing additional strength, efficiency, or wisdom to the government of the nation, respectfully petition that we may be allowed to remain under the protection of that government, in the condition allotted us by nature, by custom, and by religion,"—have duly considered the same, and submit the following

REPORT:

The Committee entered upon the work assigned to them, deeply impressed with a sense of its magnitude and importance, and determined to give it a full and fair investigation. However lightly previous legislatures may have passed over the subject, the Committee are of opinion that the time has now arrived when this great question must be squarely and fully met, thoroughly examined, and such action taken, as facts, sound reason, political progress, and a more clear, accurate, and profound view of the nature, claims, capacity and wants of woman demand.

3

We have received much assistance, in preparing this Report, from the various speakers who addressed the Committee, as well as from the Hon. Samuel E. Sewall, of Boston, long the distinguished advocate of this cause.

John Stuart Mill has well remarked, that "all reforms have to pass through three stages: ridicule, argument, and adoption." This reform has already passed beyond ridicule, into serious, sober argument; and will, we believe, soon reach the final stage, by being incorporated into all our organic and statute laws.

The number and character of the petitioners is itself a significant fact. About eight thousand intelligent women and men, a majority of them women, citizens of Massachusetts, have asked for woman's suffrage. Many of these petitioners are people of the highest culture and character, and all of them entitled to full consideration. Seventeen out of the nineteen students in the Harvard Divinity School are among the petitioners.

The Committee, upon full notice in the papers, had two public hearings in the Green Room; the first, March 30, the second, April 14; and the subject was presented with great ability to the Committee, and crowded, cultivated, appreciative audiences, by Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, Wendell Phillips, Esq., Mrs. Lucy Stone Blackwell, Rev. James Freeman Clarke, and Hon. George F. Hoar. And, although full opportunity was given, no one appeared publicly to oppose, or speak against the measure. A communication, however, against woman's suffrage, written by Miss Almira Seymour, one of the public teachers of Boston, was sent to the Committee. It was a well written, able, earnest, and evidently conscientious appeal to the Committee not to substitute the franchise for home.

In the outset the Committee think that far too limited a view of this reform is generally taken by the popular mind. It is usually associated only with the inconveniences or objectionable features of going to the polls. But this act of voting is only a part, perhaps not the most important part, of the objects to be accomplished. Results, many and grave, will follow as the necessary consequence of woman's suffrage. With suffrage, she will hold a power which will soon make itself felt at every point affecting the rights and condition of woman. The idea that she is the inferior, that she should occupy

a secondary or 4 menial position, which has come down to us from the dark ages, will vanish, and woman will by and by take the position that she was designed to fill, as the equal, not the inferior, or superior, of the other sex.

Female labor will not long go unrewarded, or be turned off with a mere pittance; but women will demand and receive wages, in the same proportion for services rendered, as the other sex. Office will also follow the ballot. Not that every woman will leave the kitchen and parlor and rush at once to the caucus and halls of legislation. But just so far and fast as she shows capacity and adaptation, and the people desire her services, she will come to share with men the honors and emoluments of office. And who doubts the capacity and adaptation of women to occupy places on school committees; to fill the various offices of parish, church, and public charities; to be managers of savings institutions and trust funds; to be administrators and guardians; to be clerks, bookkeepers, and saleswomen; to be teachers in all our public and private schools, Sunday schools, seminaries, colleges, and medical institutions? Indeed, she seems peculiarly fitted for all these. Nor will she long, with the ballot in her hand, be excluded from a share in the positions in the civil service of our National and State governments. We believe she is peculiarly fitted to fill many of the places in the post-office department; and we should rejoice to see the poor, the unfortunate, the patriotic women of the country fill these places. What a just reward would it be to those who have lost husbands and sons and brothers in the war; who have toiled and suffered and sacrificed at home, and in hospitals and sanitary work, for the success of the loyal cause. And we are glad to see in our noble and patriotic President a recognition of women's right to office; and we hope he will inaugurate a policy in this direction far more extensive than he has yet done.

When women are elected to office, no doubt some will be elected who are unfit for it, just as some men are now. The best women may not always consent to be candidates. The best men do not always consent to be candidates now. But as we now endeavor to put the right man in the right place, so we shall probably do our best to put no woman into an office, unless she is adapted to it and qualified for it. Our sanitary commission during the war of the rebellion included women as competent as Florence Nightingale to direct a system of public charities. We already have women able in speech and wise in counsel for various departments of civil affairs. When we find a woman of the military capacity of Joan of Arc, we shall make her our general; when we meet with one with the executive ability of Zenobia, or Queen Elizabeth, we shall elect her governor, or president, and not before.

Woman will also, so far as her taste and capacity shall warrant, enter the learned professions and compete with men in these high and noble fields of power and usefulness. Already is she improving to some extent the opportunities which two of these professions hold out to her peculiar capacity

and skill; and we see no reason why she may not become, if she desires, a successful disciple of Blackstone. She has already established her claim to success in the medical profession, for which all must admit that she possesses the best and most practical requisites. And as religion is not a system of mathematics, logic, or rhetoric, but a Divine plan to save men by changing the heart and life, a system adapted to all ages, classes and condition of society, to the child, to the ignorant, the low, and the fallen, more especially, we believe that women are even better qualified than men to enter and occupy this great moral field, not of dry, useless theology, but of sincere, living of Christian heart-work, which is destined to change the face of society, and bring our lost, revolted world back to Christ.

Public speaking by women will also follow the franchise, as a more common thing. Not that many women will desire to take the stump, the rostrum, or the pulpit. But public opinion will encourage and sanction, instead of frowning upon their efforts to speak, whenever, and wherever, political or religious duty requires it. Women now grace every theatre in the land, and eager listening throngs are charmed and fascinated by their wit, action and eloquence, and we fear are too often weakened in moral strength by these public exhibitions of the gentler sex. And while women of all ages and gifts are making their influence thus widely felt on the stage, shall our more conscientious, moral, religious women remain silent, and never lift their voices in public speech or prayer in the vast religious and reformatory movements of the age? Shall the 6 best thoughts, the keenest wit, the brightest intuitions, and not unfrequently the soundest judgment, be lost for want of expression on all public occasions where men and women meet? Shall we always remain slaves to a custom which deprives the school, the parish and the conference meetings of the aid and influence which women might bring into such deliberations? Shall the lips of the pure, the gifted and the noble be sealed, while the coarser and often less cultivated sex monopolize every public occasion?

In the long, dark ages of barbarism, man separated what God joined together, and woman was a mere slave, an article of merchandise, a toy, a plaything, a weak, vain, contemptible thing. But the Star in the East which heralded the birth of Christ, also heralded the enfranchisement of woman. And already what progress has she made, and what capacities does she disclose! As a reader, a writer, a teacher, a purifier and refiner of the home and social circle, her influence is equal if not superior to that of man. Give her suffrage, and will she not refine and civilize our politics? In the primary meetings and halls of legislation, who can say that her influence will not be as potent and salutary as in the domestic circle? Good men too often will not enter the arena of politics, and consequently the field is occupied by those who pander to the lowest passions and ambitions of the people. And thus designing, corrupt men have obtained the high places of influence, and all public and private interests have suffered in consequence. Now who can say that the voting of women will not tend to drive bad men from place, reform the bribery, corruptions, abuses, rings

and cliques which now so often disgust the nation, plunder the treasury, and endanger the liberties of the people? Who can say that this great power of woman's suffrage, not yet called into exercise, will not very greatly diminish the ills which afflict the body politic? Since the abolition of slavery, intemperance is our great national sin and crime. It is making more havoc with property, life, health and religion than all other causes combined. Who can say that woman's suffrage is not the reserved force which God will employ when all other means fail to drive the monster from the land? If we do not heed the voices of those mothers which have come up to us from so many thousand homes in our State, 7 imploring *us* to act on this great question, let us not withhold from them the right of suffrage, so that they may act for *themselves*

Finally, how many woman fall, or waste life for want of objects within their reach, calculated to attract their attention, and enlist the energies of their better natures! Open to them the same career which now excites the ambition of men; place women on a level with men, in every field where effort is rewarded with honor or profit; lift them to an equality with men, in all the great stakes of life; and how many would be saved from lives of sin and shame; and how many more, who follow the empty bauble of fashion, and cramp the soul and torture the body, by bowing to its devilish mandates, would rise to conditions of power and usefulness, commensurate with their now wasted or misdirected capacities! How many poor needle-women, who now starve and suffer, and die in unventilated cellars and garrets, would just begin to see that the world was not made nor society organized on purpose to cheat, and starve, and murder the poor, the unfortunate and the defenceless! In the expressive language of the late lamented Governor Andrew, how many "anxious and aimless" women do we find who fail to accomplish all which their better natures crave to fulfil, simply because they are victims to laws and customs, not founded in nature, revelation, justice or common sense! It is not genius or capacity or education, but *opportunity* which woman wants. Give her this, and she will make her power felt, and her usefulness tell on the world's best interests, in fields of progress and reform never occupied by her before. And the world will marvel at the power for good, which has been so long overlooked and neglected.

But the Committee will not dwell longer upon the results which will follow the adoption of this great reform. Indeed, no one can foresee all the consequences which will ensue. The advent of the Saviour was the great event of the world, and God alone could map out all the blessings to the race which have come, and are destined to come through his life, sufferings and death. The declaration of American independence, and the abolition of slavery, are the two great events of our history. But what finite mind would attempt to enumerate all the blessed consequences which history will trace to these two wonderful 8 sources? The full enfranchisement of woman is the next great change which will take place in our political system. And while the Committee think the change to be right,

just, inevitable, and not far distant, it would be presumption in them to undertake to predict all the benefits which will accrue therefrom.

This is no new subject. It has long been agitated, not only in the Eastern and Middle, but especially in the Western States. Conventions on this subject were held in Ohio as far back as 1848, and in Massachusetts in 1850 and 1852. It has been gradually growing in public favor, until it has become one of the great, if not the greatest question of the day. The right of female suffrage is the almost universal movement of the thoughtful mind of the age, with John Stuart Mill at its head. It has made more progress in England than in this country. A petition to Parliament in its favor contained the names of many of the leading writers in England, and two-thirds of the minds which make the English tongue so rich; and the Committee append to their Report some extracts from the masterly speech of John Stuart Mill, delivered in Parliament in 1867, which strengthen the positions taken by the Committee.^{*}

^{*} See Appendix A.

But, aside from this preliminary and general view, let us examine the subject upon its merits, and by all the tests applicable to the case.

In what consists a qualification to vote? It is a capacity to exercise a rational choice. A voter should possess three requisites. With these he is a safe depository of political power. These requisites are, first, a desire for the public welfare; second, a capacity to judge of the character and qualifications of persons elected to office; and third, a capacity to judge of the effect of public measures. Infants would be excluded as not possessing the second and third qualifications. Foreigners are kept awhile on probation, lest they should not fulfil the first requisite; while lunatics and criminals are excluded as not possessing either qualification.

But how completely does woman possess all these requisites. First, she desires the public welfare. She loves peace and order. The family, the domestic circle, a happy home, is the one great idea and aim of her life. This inheres in her constitution, grows with her growth and strengthens with her strength. No class of people have so great a stake in the laws as mothers. Other governments are based more or less upon military glory; a republic rests for its security upon quiet, peaceful, happy homes. Woman, as a general thing, will vote against all policies, measures and laws which tend to impair the security or disturb the quiet and happiness of home, and thus she will secure the public welfare. Second, women are excellent judges of character. In this they excel men. They judge by instinct. They are quick, intuitive, and would be less likely than men to mistake or misjudge the qualifications of candidates for office. Third, they can judge as well, if not better than men, of the effect of public measures. This would especially be the case when their minds were educated

and raised to a level with the responsibilities which the franchise would impose upon them. And we believe that, as a general thing, the judgment of women upon public measures would emanate from a higher and purer stand-point, and be less influenced by ambitious, selfish considerations than that of men. And if we look to England, will not Queen Elizabeth, Queen Anne and Queen Victoria, either or all of them, compare favorably with any king who has inherited the English throne since the reformation? And in the whole list of the sovereigns of Europe, no names are brighter than those of Isabella of Spain, Maria Theresa, and Queen Victoria.

Take another view of the subject. Suffrage is a plan or contrivance to express public opinion. There are three systems of government as affected by suffrage. First, where there is no suffrage; second, where there is limited suffrage; third, universal suffrage, that is, universal as applied to the case. Minors, lunatics and criminals are excluded for reasons applicable to themselves.

In the first case, we have an absolute despotism,—the will of one man, with all his subjects unprotected and at his mercy. In the second case, we have suffrage limited to the higher classes, or based on property. The result is class legislation; while the masses have no remedy but in revolution. The theory of our politics is universal suffrage. Let the whole public mind express itself, and pass through suffrage into government. 10 This includes, to be sure, the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant, the moral and the vicious. But this is best, on the whole, and has so proved itself. This is the broad basis on which our government stands, and which, like the foundation of the pyramids of Egypt, supports the vast and complicated superstructure. Poverty and wealth, virtue and vice, ignorance and knowledge, truth and falsehood, balance and neutralize each other.

Under this system, reforms come through the ballot instead of revolution. Universal suffrage is a modern, new principle, we admit. But it is the result of the most careful examination and scrutiny of all the other systems of government which have preceded it, and approaches the nearest to perfection of any system yet adopted, and is founded, as we believe, not only in natural right, but in the teachings of Christianity. And we believe it to be the wisest, safest and grandest principle yet introduced into human government; and with free schools, a free press, free speech and a free church, we believe it will prove a safe and enduring principle. If this is our theory,—the American theory—why should woman be excluded? Why should one-half of our people be deprived of any part in this wonderful political discovery, by which all governmental reforms are to be achieved, universal liberty, equality and fraternity established, abuses discontinued, and all classes elevated to their true political, social and moral condition?

But let us go still deeper into the subject, and try the question by the test of natural and constitutional right.

The Declaration of Independence declares that “*all men are created equal*,” and that they have “*unalienable rights*.” It declares, further, that “governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.”

The Declaration of Rights, adopted by the Continental Congress in 1775, declared “that the foundation of English liberty, *and of all free government*, is a right in the people to participate in their legislative council.”

The Constitution of Massachusetts says, “All men are born free and equal.”

It is plain that these propositions rightfully cover human beings without distinction of sex, and that they are applicable to women no less than to men. Certainly women, no less than 11 men, are among “the governed;” certainly they are a part of “the people;” certainly, many of them are taxed.

The House of Representatives of Massachusetts, in 1764, declared “that the imposition of duties and taxes by the parliament of Great Britain, upon a people *not represented* in the House of Commons, is absolutely irreconcilable with their rights.” The expressions, “Taxation without representation is tyranny,” and, “If we are not represented, we are slaves,” were freely used, as self-evident truths, in the mouths of our patriot fathers. Nor was this view peculiar to them. An eminent English jurist, Chief Justice Pratt, said, “My position is this—taxation and representation are inseparable. The position is founded in the law of nature. It is more; it is itself an eternal law of nature.” And Lord Coke says, “The very act of taxing those who are not represented, appears to me to deprive them of one of their essential rights as freemen, and if continued, seems to be in effect an entire disfranchisement of every civil right; for what civil right is worth a rush, after a man's property is subject to be taken from him without his consent.”

There is evidence that, in early times, women did vote—in conformity with these principles—in the land from which we came. Centuries ago, women voted in English counties, and some of the English boroughs; and New Jersey long retained the custom on this side the ocean.

But the very right thus claimed as natural, obvious and incontrovertible, by the best authorities, English and American, is systematically disregarded in our State. Thousands of women pay taxes in Massachusetts, some of them very large ones. In Boston alone they are taxed on \$28,000,000 of real, and \$13,000,000 of personal property. We are accustomed to assume the possession of a high moral

tone, of an elevated character, in our Commonwealth; but we are habitually doing to our women that very injustice, the infliction of which caused our fathers to rise in rebellion against England.

When the rights of the *men* of this nation were in question, the statements above quoted as to the absolute injustice of withholding representation from people who pay taxes were claimed as self-evident; they have become a constituent part of American literature; they hold a fixed place as proverbs, as axioms, in the mouths of our people. But custom is often more powerful than reason, and however keenly a portion of our women have felt their disabilities, the *men* of the Commonwealth have remained insensible to the force of their claim, and unconscious that it stands on the same broad foundation with the revolt of their fathers against England; so, when these conservative sons of progressive fathers are compelled to argue the question, some say that the distinction of sex is sufficient to take women out of that category; and others say that women have already a virtual and a sufficient representation. A few words upon each of these points may be needful in this Report.

We may notice first, that, as to such a right as voting, the distinction of sex is immaterial. What is a vote? It is merely the expression of an opinion. And capacity for voting is merely capacity to form an opinion on a political question. Certainly sex does not destroy a woman's ability to form an opinion; and no one pretends that the women of Massachusetts are destitute of this power. Among the reasons why we need their co-operation in politics are these: that so large a number of them are fruitful in thought, and forcible in expression, and guided by a high moral purpose in their course of action. These are the very qualities needed for the purification of our political atmosphere, for the reform of our official life. If it be objected that only a portion of our women possess these qualifications, and that others are frivolous and silly, it is obvious to reply that the many similarly incompetent among men do not for that reason lose even their own votes; still less do they cause the votes of the whole class of men to be disallowed.

We claim a high probability of benefit, both to women and the community, from the change proposed.

The ballot is the key that opens one's way to all other rights, to all privileges. It places in the hands of the class which wields it, the fullest power to protect itself. Once give to this sex a vote, and very soon the unequal laws that allow husbands such unfair and dangerous power over a wife's person would be annulled.

To a class wielding this great power all our colleges and other institutions of learning would soon open their doors. All the inequality and abuses that still deform the statute book in regard to the rights of women, married and single, would cease.

13

The right to vote, bringing with it a sense of responsibility in the use of such a right, would create in women a deeper interest in the great social problems which form the gravest portion of what we call politics. They would study with a keener interest when they saw the use life would make of their studies. If there be any truth in the usual complaint that so many of the sex waste life in what is frivolous or passing importance only the way to cure the evil is to summon them to a fair responsibility on questions of importance. Education, the best education, does not come from books; it is made out of experience. It is the outgrowth and result of a deep interest in great questions, and a personal share in the world's affairs.

Again, the ballot would rouse woman to a full sense of her power, and the responsibility this entails. No thoughtful man fails to see how great, how almost unlimited, is the influence of woman. The right to the ballot will hardly increase this. What we understand the petitioners to ask is, that in the place of concealed and indirect influence, woman may have open, direct power. The first wakens no proper sense of responsibility; the last would do so, and so lift the level of women's thought and study.

We quote on this point the testimony of one of the most sagacious and competent observers of modern society, M. de Tocqueville. In France, certainly, the personal interest of woman in politics has been greater and closer than in most nations. But he testifies that this interest and influence, close and great as they were, never lifted woman to her true place, or a full sense of her responsibility in that sphere. Writing to a lady of the highest intelligence, he says of women:—

“Religion makes them faithful wives, excellent mothers, just and indulgent mistresses, and kind to the poor. But of public duties they seem not to have a notion. That they do not perform any may be natural; but they do not even inculcate their performance. This side of education has escaped their notice.”

The Committee next invoke the attention of the legislature to our various statutes upon this subject.

Our Massachusetts laws, after all their revisions and amendments, still contain some provisions unjust and injurious to 14 women; such as would never have been enacted had women co-operated with men in the work of legislation. It is worthy of special observation that it is in the very important relations of wife and mother that these provisions of the law bear hardly upon women. Some of

these provisions will be found in a compilation recently issued by Hon. Samuel E. Sewall of Boston, giving, in connection with them, some of the comments of that sagacious and experienced lawyer.

Such inequalities, so far as they exist, will not, in the judgment of the Committee long be suffered to remain, now that such numbers of our best men and women are awake to the necessity of a change. The only question is, How shall this change be made? In the way of palliation or of cure? By reluctant and partial concessions, or by a frank administration of full justice? By taking up the above provisions, and the many more kindred ones, for amendment, and wrangling over each to try how much of the old system can still be preserved, or by adopting a just foundation principle, which, standing firm and level, may make manifest at a glance what other parts of the structure are unsymmetrical and out of order?

The old English law, from which ours is derived, placed all power in the hands of the man, enabling him to say, husband and wife are one, and I am that one. As intelligence advanced, it has been seen that many of the details of this despotic power were too gross for longer endurance, and so item after item has been erased from the statute book. It is plain that this process cannot stop while a single unjust distinction of the class in question remains. The question forced upon us by these petitions, sent from all parts of the State, and numerous signed by men and women among the highest among the highest in intelligence and character, is whether, instead of taking time to deal with each separate specification of injustice, we should not bring upon the entire class for judgment, and accept a principle which, by its spontaneous working, will set all these details in order. These unjust provisions exist because women have not been represented. To give them just representation is the shortest and surest way to remove these inequalities.

Throughout the whole consideration of these petitions, we could not but remember the large activity of women in the late war. Time, toil, skill, and most patient care, were given by 15 them, without stint, to all associations which deepened the enthusiasm, roused the courage, ministered to the comfort, or guarded the health of the army. In the hospital, they were untiring.

Of course, such cares made inevitable a keen interest in the grave questions involved in the struggle. It is impossible, now that the conflict is over, that women so moved and lifted for eight heroic years should contentedly sink back to that narrow round which has been sometimes dignified with the name of "woman's sphere." They naturally watch with something of the same enthusiastic interest, the currents and channels of that political life which, these years have shown them, lead to such momentous results. And why should not Massachusetts be the first to adopt this so much reform? She has always led in all the great events which have marked our progress as a State or nation. She shed the first blood in the war of the revolution, and of the rebellion. She furnished the first martyrs in the war which inaugurated, and the war which will forever perpetuate the Union. Her system of

schools and public charities adds scarcely less to her name and fame, than Concord, Lexington, and Bunker Hill. Her capital, after developing her own resources, seeks in the far West new fields of progress and profit, until it has linked the city of Boston with the finest granaries of the world, and spanned the continent by means of her railroads. Let her not lose the opportunity of achieving, first of all the States, this great political reform, which will, in our opinion, not only add to the strength and usefulness of our local politics, but will purify and enlarge our influence, now so justly great, as acknowledged by all, in the general government.

It only remains for the Committee to answer some of the popular objections which are usually urged against woman's suffrage. Some of these objections we shall discuss with great brevity, as they have already been met, to a great extent, by the arguments adduced in favor of this reform, corroborated by the extracts from the great speech of John Stuart Mill, found in the Appendix to this Report.

I. For Woman to vote, it is very commonly asserted, "they must leave their peculiar and appropriate sphere, and lose the delicacy naturally belonging to their sex."

16

It will be noticed, in the first place, that these are mere assumptions, and that, until they are supported by adequate argument and evidence, (which you Committee are free to say, they have not yet seen,) it is sufficient to reply to them by such counter-assumptions as flow directly from the "self-evident truths" hereinabove recited.

It is noticeable, next, that these unproved assumptions are made by the "ins" against the "outs," by people having possession of certain powers, which they use, as well shall presently show, to the injury, in various ways, of the disfranchised portion of the community, and making this claim in opposition to admitted general principles and valid reasons urged by the other side. It is a claim of monopolists to continue their monopoly. It is a plea of custom, in opposition to reason and right.

"The despotism of custom," says Stuart Mill, in his able speech on this subject in the House of Commons, "the despotism of custom is on the wane. We are not now content to know that things are; we ask whether they ought to be. And in this House, I am about to suppose that an appeal lies from custom to a higher tribunal, in which reason is judge."

The claim that women, because they are women, ought to remain as they are, and ought *not* to occupy any relations, or claim any rights, other than those now conceded to them, is equally made, and is made with equal validity, by the men of Hindostan, of Circassia, and of Turkey, against their women. To them it would appear monstrous, unnatural, indelicate, irreligious, for a widow to object to being burned with the body of her husband; for a virgin to object to being sold by her father

to be the concubine of the highest bidder; for a woman of any sort to pass through the street in pursuance of her rightful and proper business, without a veil over her face. Public opinion is made the supreme rule of these matters there, just as it used here to impose upon women taxation without representation. We appeal from custom to reason. We decline to accept the present customs of any existing nation as an ultimate measure of the "appropriate sphere" of woman.

The demand for "delicacy" among women's character, and the dread of "indelicacy" among women, are strongly insisted on by the advocates of "things as they are," and exercise, no 17 doubt, a wide-spread influence. These are precisely the feelings which lead the Turk to require his women to cover their faces everywhere but in their own apartments; the impression is as genuine, and as strong, with him, as with our conservatives; but if we seek a reasonable ground for this impression, we shall find it as absolutely wanting in the one case as in the other. Moreover, if we examine the details of those actions of women which it is proposed to limit by such a rule, we shall find that the rule owes all its force to prejudice, fortified and perpetuated by misstatement. Take, for instance, the way in which the act of voting is stated by the opponents of women's suffrage. Our examples shall be drawn only from the most respectable and creditable of these opponents.

Professor Tayler Lewis says: "In the first place, then, females should not vote, for their own sake. Instead of the denial of a right, it is a blessed exemption. The preservation of that pure feminine character on which so much depends the highest well being of society, demands that they should be shielded from the turbulence and corruption, the odious and obscene strifes of outward political contests."

Rev. Dr. Todd, of Pittsfield, in his book called "Woman's Rights," states the matter more energetically. He says: "Moreover, there is something so unseemly in having women wading in the dirty waters of politics, dragging and wrangling round the ballot-boxes, e. g. mingling with the mobs and rowdies of New York city, that I wonder she ever thinks of it." Why does Dr. Todd, living in the quiet little town of Pittsfield, where no disorder at the polls *ever* occurred—living in Massachusetts, in whose *cities* even, trouble or violence at the polls is a rarely exceptional occurrence—feel obliged to go to New York city for an illustration? Is it because over-statement is absolutely essential to his case? Is it because if he painted the polls as they are in a very great majority of towns, there would appear no difficulty in a woman's quietly depositing her ballot there? The first thought excited by these and other similar statements is that they are excessive *over* statements of the condition of things is ninety-nine out of a hundred of the polling places throughout this State. In most of our towns and cities, a woman would find no more obstruction or annoyance in going to vote than she would in going to the post-office, 18 or going to buy a handkerchief, or a pair of gloves. And even in the exceptional cases, if there be such, she could easily stay away. Very few votes would be lost from this cause.

But further, it is noteworthy, that these writers, painting our existing politics in such dark colors, do not propose, or expect, to have them improved for *men*. They apparently acquiesce in the deplorable state of manners and morals which they describe, and neither move, nor expect any of the men, their political associates, to move in the direction of reform. If their chosen method shall be still pursued they have (apparently) no hope but that men of clean morals will keep away from the elections of town, county and State officials, and leave the worst part of the population to elect *their* favorite candidates. Here, as well as in the argument, the advocates of women's suffrage have the advantage of them. For they see that deterioration is to be expected from the systematic exclusion of one sex from an important department of the thought and work of human society; they see that as men and women grow worse, and lead poorer and meaner lives when completely separated from each other in convents and monasteries, so the artificial exclusion of one sex from any particular department of life works injury to that department; and they propose, not that this evil shall continue and increase, but that a remedy shall be applied. One chief reason why disorder sometimes occurs at a polling-station is because the refining influences of woman's presence are excluded from it. The expected participation of women in that duty, the bare knowledge that they were to come to that place to deposit their votes, would have a very strong tendency to abate any customary uncomeliness in the place and in the frequenters of it; but, if in any instance a woman *were* insulted in the act of voting, a storm of indignation would be aroused which would take effectual measures to make that place, forever after, as safe for a lady as her own parlor. But who ever saw a man mean enough to insult a woman at the polls? If there exist such meanness, it would be a reason for excluding men, not women. On this point we quote from the searching and admirable address of Henry Ward Beecher, at Cooper Institute, N.Y., February 2, 1869:—

“And when it is asked, ‘Would you go among brutal rowdies with your wife and daughter, and subject them to their insults?’ 19 I reply, if it were understood to be not an intrusion, nor a violation of constituted law, but a thing in accordance with both custom and law, I would take my wife and daughter, and walk, I care not into what precinct or neighborhood; and there is not, in the United States, a place where they would not be safe. Or if there were one drunken creature to mistreat them, there would be five and twenty stalwart men to crush the miscreant! For when it is once the custom for women to mingle in public affairs with men, there will not be found a class of men in our land that will not respect her presence. Now and then I see a man that walks in the street smoking, with a woman on his arm—but only now and then. Once in a while, I see a man that rides in an omnibus smoking, when there is a woman in it—but only once in a while. These are exceptions. Men instinctively reverence women. Nor is this the peculiarity of men of cultivation or wealth. Men who toil at the blacksmith's forge and in the various other departments of manual labor—men whose hands are so hard that they would almost strike fire steel—have under their brawny ribs a heart that loves and reverse the purity of woman. And in whatever sphere her duties might call her, if she were

admitted to it by custom or law, we would meet her as they now meet her in the sanctuary and in these halls."

II. Another popular objection to the voting of women is the claim that they are already virtually represented—by the *men* of their respective communities. It is confidently asked, cannot men be trusted with the interests of their own mothers, wives, sisters, daughters? The answer is No, they cannot! Many men are in the habit of doing daily injustice to one or another of these relations; and every one knows scores of men whom he would not trust with the rights or the welfare of his female relatives. But in regard to the question whether the body of men of this State are to be trusted to make laws providing full justice for its women, we are not left to speculation or conjecture. The statute book answers that question, and your Committee ask your attention to evidence from the General Statutes, showing that the rights and interests of women, both in regard to their persons and their property, are grossly violated by our present laws. We again quote from the same address of Mr. Beecher on this point:—

"But I ask why does not this argument in respect to woman's influence hold just as good in everything else as in public affairs? Why do you say, 'a woman ought not to be a school teacher; if she wishes to teach the race, let her influence her father and brothers and husband, and act through them?' Why not say, 'a woman ought not to be an artist, and daub her fingers with paint; let her influence her father and brothers and husband to paint?' Or, 'a woman ought not to waste her strength in writing; let her influence her father and brothers and husband to write.' Why do you not say in short, 'woman is a mere silent, interior, reserved force, and man is the universal engine to be set in operation by her.' There is, undoubtedly, such a thing as indirect influence, as general influence; but I have noticed that men who wish things to remain as they are, are in favor always of general influences, in distinction from directly applied forces. It is open, direct, applied force, that abates evil or promotes good."

III. It is said the vicious and the ignorant will outvote the good and wise. But the proportion of the vicious among women is certainly no greater than among men; yet universal suffrage as applied to men is now an established success. But this is the old story. You must not learn to read, lest you read bad books; nor to reason, lest you become an infidel. The ballot has always been obliged to encounter this prejudice at every stage of its progress. First, none but the upper classes, the aristocracy, could be trusted with it; then property was a qualification; then white men alone must enjoy the franchise; and now that negroes are permitted to vote, women must certainly be prohibited. But the same principle of progress and justice, which has given liberty and the ballot to the slave, will give the ballot to woman. We are only on the threshold of constitutional liberty. More light is to break upon us from nature, from society, from revelation. The Sermon on the Mount and

the Golde Rule are to become in time the test and measure of all human action and human laws; and woman bringing all her finer qualities into full co-operation with men in social, civil and religious life, will hasten that period.

IV. It is objected that women do not want the ballot. This may be true to some extent; especially with that class of women who have not reflected upon the subject, and who from habit, custom, or prejudice, or from dislike of change, think they had rather bear the ills they have, than fly to others they 21 know not of. But this objection is not sustained by the large number of petitioners who appeared before the legislature. It is very rare that so many citizens of either sex ask for any favor or right at the hands of the legislature. Nor did the women who crowded the Green Room at each hearing, listening with entire approbation to the various speakers, show that female suffrage is not desired. On each occasion the room was crowded to its utmost capacity, the larger portion being women, and most of them of the highest culture and character; and we doubt not many more would have attended could the Committee have obtained a larger room. But if women are capable of exercising this right, the best interests of the State demand that they should have it, and it would be a criminal neglect of duty on our part to withhold it from them. It was said that slaves did not desire freedom, and the ballot; was that an argument against extending these rights to them? No more would it be a reason for depriving woman of the franchise. What loyal woman would not have voted at Lincoln's second election, when the fate of the country turned upon the result?

V. But women do not go to war and fight, and therefore are not entitled to the ballot. We have already alluded to the part they did take in our last great war. But it is said woman does not expose her life. Every soldier that is born brings some woman down to the very gates of death. Thirty-five thousand women every year in Massachusetts encounter pains and risks to life, which if brought together would surpass the pangs and sufferings of any battle-field in the war of the great rebellion—and all this to keep the ranks of the civilians and the soldiers full. And shall these mothers now be taunted with the idea that they are disqualified to vote till they go out and shoot somebody?

VI. It is also said the ballot will lead to divisions, jars and quarrels in families. The same objection lies against religious liberty. It does not break up families to allow husband and wife each to enjoy his or her religious faith. Nor would it here. They would generally agree. But when they differed it would produce no more discord than it does in religious differences. How often now do members of the same family differ 22 in politics? who has not seen, even in New England, father and son, or two brothers, one voting to sustain the Union and the flag, the other to lend "aid and comfort" to the enemy? It is a cardinal principle in our American government that every citizen may hold and enjoy his own political and religious faith; and so deep is this planted in our people, that no harm could come on this score from an extension of the franchise to woman.

VII. Finally, it is objected that the Bible is against the reform we are advocating. It is of the utmost importance to every Christian man to know what the inspired volume teaches on this or any other subject under consideration. But we believe the Bible, thoroughly studied and correctly interpreted, so far from being in conflict with this change in the political condition of woman, aims at the establishment of perfect equality of all races and both sexes before human laws. The fundamental principle of Christianity is equality, progress, growth, improvement. No one now thinks of holding us to all the provisions of the Mosaic law. The Christianity of the New Testament was a spiritual kingdom, not a political or a social system. It recognized the existing civilization of the age—not as conditions which would never change, but as a necessity which would continue till swept away by the light of religion itself,—so that we must not confound any recognition which Christ or the apostles made of the existing order of things, for the purpose of propagating this spiritual kingdom, as an argument in favor of the perpetual continuance of that condition of political or social life.

An argument against woman's suffrage is taken from some passages in the New Testament, which seem to teach the subordination of woman and to direct that she shall take no part in public affairs.

On the other hand, there are other texts which declare the equality of woman with man, and set aside all distinctions of privilege or opportunity based on difference of sex. To the latter class belong such passages as these (Galatians iii. 28:) "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, *there is neither male nor female*; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." To the former class belong the texts in which the apostle (I. Cor. xiv. 34) says, "Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law; and if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame" (perhaps better a "disgrace," "discreditable,") "for woman to speak in the church." In the first of the above texts, the apostle lays down a broad principle; in the other, he limits its application in a particular case. Now, it often happens that a principle indubitably and universally true, cannot be immediately put in execution. An example of this is to be found Matt. xix. 3-9. Jesus here lays down the principle that according to the ideal view of marriage, it is a merging of the two separate personalities in one. According to this original and divine idea, divorce, except for the crime which dissolves the marriage itself, is wrong, and ought not to be allowed. Yet Moses, a divine law-giver, allowed it. Why did he do so? He permitted men to divorce their wives for "some uncleanness." (Deut. xxiv. 1.) Jesus answers, "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives—but from the beginning it was not so." Law regards the eternal truth; legislation the present possibility. When, therefore, we find in the Bible a *principle* laid down looking one way, and a *DIRECTION* or command looking the other way, we may be pretty sure that the principle is one of eternal law, the command of merely temporary legislation. The principle *here*, is that in Christianity there is no difference between man and woman.

The command, is that while Christian men may give Christian instruction in the churches, Christian women must not. The first is eternal law, the second is only temporary legislation. Now, can we find any state of circumstances, existing in Greece at that time, which made it disgraceful and discreditable for women to appear in public, and to teach in public? We *can* find such reasons in existing circumstances. Potter ("Antiquities of Greece," iv. 13,) says "that the Greek women of a respectable character were rarely allowed to appear in public, but had assigned to them a secluded part of the house. Their rooms were secured with bolts and locks. When they went abroad they were closely veiled. In Athens, [he says,] there were three classes of beings—men, woman and courtezans. To the women were assigned retirement, constraint, 24 ignorance and legal respect. To the other class, freedom, education, accomplishments and contempt." It appears from a treatise of Xenophon, that the virtuous woman in Athens "lived under a *surveillance* which the severity of a nunnery could hardly exceed. Her organs of sight, hearing and speech were strictly restrained, and the whole care of her friends confined to letting her see as little, hear as little, and ask questions as little as possible." What a change there had already taken place in the condition of women, under the emancipating influence of Christianity, where they were already freely allowed to attend the frequent meetings of the church, had already begun to lay aside the veil, and to teach and preach in public! The danger, of course, was, that they would be confounded in the public mind with the abandoned women, so numerous in Corinth, and of course it was very proper that in such a state of society, and amid such customs, their Christian liberty should be temporarily restrained, on the principle laid down by the apostle: "All things are lawful to me, but all things are not expedient." Accordingly the apostle, while he freely allows the women to attend the public and private meetings of the church, directs them not to speak; or if they do, at least to wear a veil, the usual distinction of respectable women. (I. Cor. xi. 5.) But does it follow from this, that in such a different state of society as ours, this direction of Paul is a good reason for refusing to allow women to speak in public, or to vote? Throughout Christendom, woman is not secluded as she was in Greece and is now in Mohammedan lands, nor compelled to be thickly veiled if she goes into the street. We see no impropriety in women appearing unveiled in the streets, in churches, in public conveyances, in the places of amusement. Female teachers may publicly examine their pupils without being veiled; women may sing in public without veils, in the church and at the concert; in some of the churches they preach; in many they exhort, and the public decorum is not disturbed. If the prohibition of Paul is not enforced on these occasions, how can it possibly apply to prevent women from voting?

How is it less indecorous to walk alone through Washington Street, amid a crowd of men, to get into a car among men, or to sit at the lecture by the side of men, than to walk into a hall (which may, if necessary, be kept exclusively for women,) and deposit her vote in the ballot-box, and then walk out again?

In conclusion, the Committee recommend the adoption of the subjoined Resolve, providing for an amendment of the constitution to secure the elective franchise, and the right to hold office to women in this Commonwealth.

W. GRISWOLD, F. A. HOBART, *Of the Senate.*

F. W. BIRD, J. A. HERVEY, RODNEY FRENCH, ALFRED M. WILLIAMS, O. S. BUTLER, ADDISON G. FAY, MOSES H. HALE, *Of the House.*

26

Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In the Year One Thousand Eight Hundred and Sixty-Nine.

RESOLVE

Providing for an Amendment of the Constitution to secure the elective franchise, and the right to hold office, to Women, in this Commonwealth.

Resolved, By both houses, the same being agreed to by a majority of the senators, and two-thirds of the members of the house of representatives present and voting thereon, that it is expedient to alter the constitution of this Commonwealth by adopting the subjoined article of amendment, and that the same, as thus agreed to, be entered on the journals of both houses, with the yeas and nays taken thereon, and referred to the general court next to be chosen, and that the same be published, to the end that, if agreed to by the general court next to be chosen, in the manner provided in the constitution, it may be submitted to the people for their approval and ratification, in order that it may become a part of the constitution of the Commonwealth.

Article of Amendment.

1 The word male is hereby stricken from the third 2 article of the amendments of the constitution. Hereafter, 3 women of this Commonwealth shall have the 4 right to voting at elections, and shall be eligible to 5 office upon the same terms, conditions and qualifications, 6 and subject to the same restrictions and disabilities 7 as male citizens of this Commonwealth now are, 8 and no others.

27

APPENDIX.

[A.]

Extracts from the speech of John Stuart Mill, on Woman's Suffrage, delivered in Parliament, in 1867.

"It will be said women, as women, do not suffer any practical inconvenience by not being represented. The interests of all women are safe in the lands of their fathers, husbands and brothers, whose interest is the same with theirs, and who, besides knowing better than they do what is good for them, care a good deal more for them they care for themselves.

"Sir, this is exactly what has been said of all other unrepresented classes—the operatives, for instance; are they not all virtually represented through their employers? are not the interests of the employer and that of the employed, when properly understood, the same? To insinuate the contrary, is it not the horrible crime of setting class against class? Is not the farmer interested along with his laborer in the prosperity of agriculture? Has not the cotton manufacturer as great an interest in the high price of calicoes as his workman? Is not the employer interested as well as his men in the repeal of taxes? Have not employer and employed a common interest against outsiders, just as man and wife have against all outside the family? And are not all employers kind, benevolent, charitable men, who love their work-people, and always know and do what is most for their good? Every one of these assertions is exactly as true as the parallel assertion respecting men and women. Sir, we are not living in Arcadia, but, as we were lately reminded, in *face Romuli*; and in that region workmen need other protection than that of their masters, and women than that of their men.

"I should like to see a return laid before the house of the number of women who are annually beaten to death, kicked to death, or trodden to death, by their male protectors. I should like this document to contain, in an opposite column, a return of the sentences passed in those cases in which the dastardly criminal did not get off altogether; and in a third column a comparative view of the amount of property, the unlawful taking of which had, in the 28 same sessions or assizes, by the same judge, been thought worthy of the same degree of punishment. We should thus obtain an arithmetical estimate of the value set by a male legislature and male tribunals upon the murder of a woman by a habitual torture, often prolonged for years, which, if there be any shame in us, would make us hang our heads."

"It is said that women do not need direct political power, because they have so much indirect through the influence they possess over their male relatives and connections. Sir, I should like to try

this argument in other cases. Rich people have a great deal of indirect influence. Is this a reason for denying them a vote?

"Sir, it is true that women have already great power. It is part of my case that they have great power. But they have it under the worst possible conditions, because it is indirect, and, therefore, irresponsible. I want to make that power a responsible power. I want to make the woman feel her conscience interested in its honest exercise. I want to make her feel that it is not given to her as a mere means of personal ascendancy. I want to make her influence work by a manly interchange of opinions, and not by cajolery. I want to awaken in her the political point of honor. At present many a woman greatly influences the political conduct of her male connections, sometimes by force of will actually governs it; but she is never supposed to have anything to do with it. The man she influences, and perhaps misleads, is alone responsible. Her power is like the back-stairs influence of a favorite. The poor creature is nobody, and all is referred to the man's superior wisdom, and as, of course, he will not give way to her if he ought not, she may work upon him through all his strongest feelings without incurring any responsibility. Sir, I demand that all who exercise power should have the burden laid upon them of knowing something about the things they have power over. With the admitted right to a voice would come a sense of the corresponding duty.

"A woman is not generally inferior in tenderness of conscience to a man. Make her a moral agent in matters of public conduct. Show that you require from her a political conscience, and when she has learn to understand the transcendent importance of these things, she will see why is wrong to sacrifice political convictions for personal interest and vanity; she will understand that political honesty is not a foolish personal crotchet, which a man is bound, for the sake of his family, to give up, but a serious duty; and the men whom she can influence will be better men in all public relations, and not, as they often are at present, worse men by the whole effect of her influence."

29

"Politics, it is said, is not a woman's business. Well, sir, I am not aware that politics is a man's business either, unless he is one of the few who is paid for devoting his time to the public service, or is a member of this or of the other house. The great majority of male voters have their own business, which engrosses nearly the whole of their time; but I have never heard that the hours occupied in attending, once in a few years, at a polling booth, even if we throw in the time spent in reading newspapers and political treatises, has hitherto made them neglect their shops or their counting houses. I have not heard that those who have votes are worse merchants, or worse lawyers, or worse physicians, or even worse clergymen, than other people. One would think that the British Constitution allowed no man to vote who was not able to give up the greater part of his time to politics; if that were the case, we should have a very limited constituency.

"But let me ask, what is the meaning of political freedom? Is it not the control of those who do make a business of politics by those who do not? It is the very principle of constitutional liberty that men come from their looms and their forges to decide—and decide well—whether they are properly governed, and whom they will be governed by; and the nations who prize this privilege, and who exercise it fully, are invariably those who excel most in the common affairs of life.

"The occupations of most women are, and are likely to remain, principally domestic; but the idea that those occupations are incompatible with taking an interest in national affairs, or in any of the great concerns of humanity, is as futile as the terror once sincerely entertained, lest artisans should desert the workshop and the factory if they were taught to read.

"I know there is an obscure feeling, a feeling which is ashamed to express itself openly, that women have no right to care about anything by how they may be the most useful and devoted servants of some man. But as I am convinced that there is not one member of this house whose conscience accuses him of any such mean feeling, I may say that the claim to confiscate the whole existence of half the human species for the convenience of the other half, seems to me, independently of its injustice, particularly silly. For who that has ordinary experience of human life, and ordinary capacity for profiting by that experience, fancies that those do their own business best who understand nothing else? A man has lived to little purpose who has not learned that without general mental cultivation no particular work that requires understanding can be done in the best manner. It requires 30 brains to use practical experience; and brains, even without practical experience, go further than any amount of practical experience without brains.

"But perhaps it is thought that the ordinary occupations of women are more antagonistic than men's occupations are to any comprehension of public affairs. Perhaps it is thought that those who are principally charged with the moral education of the future generations of men must be quite unfit to judge of the moral and educational interest of a community; or that those whose chief daily business is the judicious laying out of money so as to produce the greatest results from the smallest means, could not give any lessons to right honorable gentlemen on that side of the house, or on this, who produce such singularly small results with such vast means.

"I feel a degree of confidence, sir, on this subject, which I could not feel if the political change, in itself not a great or formidable one, for which I contend, were not grounded, as beneficent and salutary political changes usually are, upon a previous social change. The idea of a peremptory and absolute line of separation between men's province of thought and women's—the notion of forbidding women to take interest in what interest men—belongs to a goneby state of society which is receding farther and farther into the past. We think and talk about the political revolutions of the world, but

we do not pay sufficient attention to the fact that there has taken place among us a silent domestic revolution: women and men are, for the first time in history, really companions. Our traditions about the proper relations between them have descended to us from a time when their lives were apart—when they were separate in their thoughts because they were separate both in their amusements and in their serious occupations. The man spent his hours of leisure among men: all his friendships, all his real intimacies were with men; with men alone did he converse on any serious subject: the wife was either a plaything or an upper servant. All this among the educated classes is changed: men no longer give up their spare time to violent out-door exercise and boisterous conviviality with male associates: the home has required the ascendancy; the two sexes now really pass their lives together: the women of the family are the man's habitual society: the wife is his chief associate, his most confidential friend, and often his most trusted counsellor.

“Now, does any man wish to have for his nearest companion, linked so closely with himself, and whose wishes and preferences have so strong claim upon him, one whose thoughts are alien from 31 those which occupy his own mind—one who can give neither help nor comfort nor support to his noblest feelings and purposes? Is this close and almost exclusive companionship compatible with women being warned off all large subjects—taught that they ought not to care about what it is the man's duty to care for, and that to take part in any serious interests outside the household is stepping beyond their province? It is for a man to pass his life in close communion of thought and feeling with a person studiously kept inferior to himself, whose earthly interests are forcibly confined within four walls, who is taught to cultivate as a grace of character ignorance and indifference about the most inspiring subjects, those among which his highest duties are cast? Does any one suppose that this can happen without detriment to the man's own character?

“Sir, the time has come when, if women are not raised to the level of men, men will be pulled down to theirs. The women of a man's family are either a stimulus and a support to his higher aspirations, or a drag upon them. You may keep them ignorant of politics, but you cannot keep them from concerning themselves with the least respectable part of politics—its personalities. If they do not understand, and cannot enter into the man's feelings of public duty, they do not care about his private interests, and that is the scale into which their weight is certain to be thrown. They are an influence always at hand, co-operating with his selfish promptings, watching and taking advantage of every moment of moral irresolution, and doubling the strength of every temptation. Even if they maintain a modest neutrality, their mere absence of sympathy hangs a dead weight upon his moral energies, and makes him averse to incur sacrifices which they will feel, and to forego worldly successes and advantages in which they would share, for the sake of objects which they cannot appreciate. But suppose him to be happily preserved from temptation to an actual sacrifice of conscience, the insensible influence on the higher parts of his own nature is still deplorable. Under

an idle notion that the beauties of character of the two sexes are mutually incompatible, men are afraid of manly women; but those who have reflected on the nature and power of social influences, know that, when there are not manly women, there will not much longer be manly men. When men and women are really companions, if women are frivolous, men will be frivolous; if women care only for personal interests and trifling amusements, men in general will care for little else. The two sexes must now rise or sink together.

"It may be said that women can take interest in great national questions without having a vote. They can, certainly; but how 32 many of them will? All that society and education can do is exhausted in inculcating on women that the rule of their conduct ought to be what society expects from them, and the denial of the vote is a proclamation, intelligible to every one, that society does not except them to concern themselves with public interests. Why, the whole of a girl's thoughts and feelings are toned down by it from her earliest school-days; she does not take the interest, even in national history, that a boy does, because it is to be no business of hers when she grows up. If there are women, and fortunately there now are, who do care about these subjects, and study them, it is because the force within is powerful enough to bear up against the worst kind of discouragement, that which acts not by interposing obstacles which may be struggled against, but by deadening the spirit which faces and conquers obstacles."